

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 and 36-41 are pending prior to entering this amendment. The examiner rejected claims 1-2, 7, 16-19, 26-29, and 36-41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Takahashi (US Patent No. 5,583,662) in view of Katori (US Patent No. 5,995,248). Applicant amends claims 1, 3, 7, 16, 18-19, 21-26, 28-29, and 36-41. Claims 1-29 and 36-41 are pending after entering this amendment. Applicant adds no new matter and requests reconsideration

Allowable Subject-Matter

Applicant thanks Examiner Worku for allowing claims 10-15 and 20-25. The examiner objected to claims 3-6, 8, and 9, but indicated they would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks Examiner Worku for pointing out claims with allowable subject matter, applicant, however, has decided not to rewrite any of claims 3-6 or 8-9 into independent form at this time.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The examiner rejected claims 1-2, 7, 16-19, 26-29, and 36-41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Takahashi in view of Katori. Applicant respectfully traverses the examiner's rejections.

Claim 1 recites *scanning a range of multiple original pixels, where one or more of the scanned original pixels corresponds to a document and processing at least one of the scanned original pixels corresponding to the document, at least in part, according to the smooth image data and the other scanned original pixels in the range.*

According to the examiner, Katori's multiplication ratio corresponds to the smooth image data. Specifically, the examiner alleges Katori's shading correction unit 52 utilization of the multiplication ratio to correct shading of scanned pixels of an original corresponds to the recited processing. Katori's multiplication ratio, however, is generated from image data corresponding to Katori's white standard plate 17, which the examiner alleges is the recited smooth image region, not from both the smooth image data and *the other scanned original pixels in the range* as the claim recites. See, col. 5,

lines 2-10, where the shading correction unit 52 multiplies scanned pixels from the original by the multiplication ratio to correct their shading. There is no disclosure in Katori of processing pixels scanned from Katori's original according to other pixels detected in the same scan, much less according to both multiplication ratio and other pixels detected in the same scan as claim 1 recites. Katori, therefore does not anticipate claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 16, 26, 36 and 40 includes features generally similar to at least some of the features of claim 1 described above. Therefore, Katori fails to anticipate these claims and their respective dependent claims.

Claim 7 recites *scanning a smooth image region to obtain a smooth image data...the smooth image data is obtained after scanning the document*. The examiner alleges Katori's white standard plate 17 corresponds to the recited smooth image region. Katori's image sensor 14, however, scans the white standard plate 17 prior to scanning any original located on glass plate 16. See, Katori, col. 5, lines 2-10, where the white standard plate 17 is "pre-scanned to obtain image data of the standard white," which is subsequently used to shade-correct data of the scanned original. There is no disclosure in Katori of scanning the white standard plate 17 after scanning the original on the glass plate 16. Nothing in Takahashi cures this deficiency, as both the applicant and examiner agree that Takahashi does not scan any smooth image region, much less scan the smooth images after scanning the recited document. See, Office Action, 6/28/2007, page 4, lines 3-4, page 7, lines 14-15, page 9, lines 10-11, and page 11, lines 10-13. Takahashi and Katori therefore do not anticipate claim 7 and its dependent claims.

Claims 19, 29, and 39 includes features generally similar to at least some of the features of claim 7 described above. Therefore, Takahashi and Katori fail to anticipate these claims and their respective dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all claims of the application as amended is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 871-7739 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP

/ Jeffrey J. Richmond /

Jeffrey J. Richmond
Reg. No. 57,564

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, Oregon 97205

Customer No. 73552